arXiv:1612.05040v1 [math.RA] 15 Dec 2016

Reachability of eigenspaces for interval circulant matrices in max algebra

Ján Plavka[a,1], Sergeĭ Sergeev[b,1,*]

[a] *Department of Mathematics and Theoretical Informatics, Technical University, B. Němcovej 32, 04200 Košice, Slovakia*
[b] *University of Birmingham, School of Mathematics, Edgbaston B15 2TT, UK*

Abstract

Nonnegative matrix A is called strongly robust if its max-algebraic eigencone is universally reachable, i.e., if the orbit of any initial vector ends up with a max-algebraic eigenvector of A. We consider the case when initial vector is restricted to an interval and A can be any matrix from a given interval of nonnegative circulant matrices. The main aim of the paper is to classify and characterize several types of interval robustness in this situation. This leads us also to study spectral theory and inclusion of attraction cones for circulant matrices in max algebra.

Keywords: Max algebra, circulant matrices, interval analysis, reachability.
AMS classification: 15A18, 15A80, 65G40, 93C55

1. Introduction

Max algebra has found applications in such fields as automata theory, image coding, scheduling theory and formal concept analysis, see e.g. [2, 4, 16, 22, 30] and plays the crucial role in the study of discrete events systems in connection with optimization problems such as scheduling or project management in which the objective function depends on the operations maximum and times (or equivalently maximum and plus via a logarithmic transform). Notice that the main principle of discrete events systems consisting of n entities is that the entities work interactively, i.e., a given entity must wait

*Corresponding author.
Email addresses: jan.plavka@tuke.sk (Ján Plavka), sergiej@gmail.com (Sergeĭ Sergeev)

before proceeding to its next event until certain others have completed their current events. The steady states of such systems correspond to the reachability of eigenspaces of max-times matrices, therefore the investigation of the properties of the reachability is important for applications.

In max algebra the matrices for which the steady states of the systems are reached with any nontrivial starting vector are called robust. Such matrices have been studied in [4], [27]. The matrices for which the steady states of the systems are reached only if a nontrivial starting vector is an eigenvector of the matrix are called weakly robust [5].

In practice, the values of the matrix entries are not exact numbers and usually they are contained in some intervals. Interval arithmetic is an efficient way to represent matrices in a guaranteed way on a computer, and a max algebra is a convenient algebraic setting to deal with some types of optimization problems, see [7, 17]. Hence, considering matrices and vectors with interval coefficients in a max algebra has great practical importance, see [11, 19, 20, 23]. A classification of the interval eigenvectors in a max algebra has been presented in [12]. Depending on the used quantifiers and their order, four types of interval eigenvectors have been studied.

The classification of interval eigenvectors mentioned above was motivated by the study of interval linear systems with interval coefficient matrix and interval right-hand side vector in classical linear algebra [25, 29]. These works put forward the notions of united solutions, controllable solutions and tolerable solutions and investigated their properties.

The main aim of the paper is to classify and characterize of six types of interval robustness for circulant matrices in max algebra. In the usual algebra, circulant matrices have a number of geometric applications [10] and play a key role in coding theory: see [31] where an algebraic construction based on circulant matrices for designing LDPC codes is suggested. In max algebra, circulant matrices appear to describe the periodic regime of sequences of matrix powers [4, 26, 27]. It is also easy to see that circulant matrices of a given dimension form a commutative semigroup, both in max algebra and in classical linear algebra.

Let us now give more details on the organization of the paper and on the results obtained there. Section 2 is devoted to basic notions of max algebra and its connections to the theory of digraphs and max-algebraic convexity. In particular, we revisit here the spectral theory, focusing on the eigencone and attraction cone associated with an arbitrary eigenvalue, the cyclicity and periodicity. Some aspects of the completely reducible matrices are also

discussed.

Section 3 starts with an exposition of the max-algebraic spectral theory of circulant matrices. We essentially collect the results that were previously obtained in [14, 15, 23, 32] describing the maximum cycle mean, the period of critical graph and the number of its components. Note that the results of [14, 15] were obtained for max-min algebra but it is explained why they apply also to max-algebraic circulants. We then proceed with a particular problem of inclusion of attraction cones for matrices A and B satisfying $A \leq B$ and having the same maximum cycle mean. It appears that inclusion $\mathrm{attr}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{attr}(B)$ holds for circulant matrices: see Theorem 3.19. However, it fails in general case: see example thereafter.

Based on the result about inclusion of attraction cones of Theorem 3.19, Section 4 characterizes various types of interval robustness which are described in Definition 2.9. Some of them can be verified in polynomial time. See Theorems 4.8, 4.10, 4.18. Other types of robustness reduce to max-algebraic two-sided systems of equations and inequalities for which efficient algorithms exist but the problem of constructing a polynomial algorithm remains open. See Theorems 4.12, 4.15, 4.17. More precise analysis of computational complexity of operations with circulants in max algebra is postponed as a topic of further research.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Main definitions and problem statements

By max algebra we mean the set of nonnegative numbers $\mathbb{R}_+$ equipped with the usual multiplication $a \cdot b$ and idempotent addition $a \oplus b := \max(a, b)$. These arithmetical operations are then routinely extended to matrices and vectors: in particular, $(A \otimes B)_{i,k} = \bigoplus_j A_{i,j} \cdot B_{j,k}$ and $(A \oplus B)_{i,j} = A_{i,j} \oplus B_{i,j}$ for any two nonnegative matrices A, B of appropriate sizes. We will also consider max-algebraic powers of matrices $A^k := \underbrace{A \otimes \ldots \otimes A}_{k}$.

In what follows, we will be interested in orbits of vectors under the action of matrices, that is, sets

$$\mathcal{O}(A, x) = \{x,\ A \otimes x,\ A^2 \otimes x, \ldots\}, \tag{1}$$

and especially in the case when the orbit of a vector hits an eigenvector of A. Let us now give formal definitions related to the max-algebraic eigenproblem.

Definition 2.1 (Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors). Value $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is called a *(max-algebraic) eigenvalue* of $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ if $A \otimes x = \lambda x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \backslash \{0\}$.

The largest eigenvalue of $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ is denoted by $\lambda(A)$.

Vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \backslash \{0\}$ satisfying $A \otimes x = \lambda x$ is called a *(max-algebraic) eigenvector* associated with A.

Definition 2.2 (Eigencones). The *eigencone of* A associated with eigenvalue λ is defined as the set of all eigenvectors of A with associated eigenvalue λ, i.e.,

$$V(A, \lambda) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \backslash \{0\} : \ A \otimes x = \lambda \otimes x\}.$$

We also denote $V(A) := V(A, \lambda(A))$.

One of the key notions of the paper is that of attraction cone: the set which comprises all vectors whose orbit hits a given eigencone.

Definition 2.3 (Attraction cones). *Attraction cone* of $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ associated with eigenvalue λ is the set

$$\mathrm{attr}(A, \lambda) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : \quad \mathcal{O}(A, x) \cap V(A, \lambda) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We also denote $\mathrm{attr}(A) := \mathrm{attr}(A, \lambda(A))$.

Any eigencone and any attraction cone is a max cone, in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 2.4 (Max cones). A set $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is called a *max cone* if for all $x \in V$, $y \in V$ any nonzero *max-linear combination* $\alpha x \oplus \beta y$ (where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$) belongs to V.

In this paper we deal with the following special class of matrices in max algebra.

Definition 2.5. *A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ is called circulant, if it has entries $A_{i,j} = a_{(j-i)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}$ for $i, j \in N$ or, equivalently, if it is of the form*

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n-2} & a_{n-1} \\ a_{n-1} & a_0 & a_1 & \dots & a_{n-3} & a_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \dots & a_{n-1} & a_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

Such circulant matrix will be also denoted by $\mathcal{Z}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$.

Circulant matrices will be the main topic of Section 3, where we will study their spectral theory and attraction cones.

Final part of this paper is devoted to intervals and interval circulant matrices.

Definition 2.6 (Intervals). Set $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is called an *interval* if it is of the form

$$\boldsymbol{X} = \times_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{X}_i,$$

for $\boldsymbol{X}_i$ nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{R}_+$ taking any of the following four forms:

$$[\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i],\ (\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i),\ (\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i],\ [\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i),$$

for $\underline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Definition 2.7 (Interval Circulant Matrices). By $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ we denote the set of all circulant matrices A such that $A_{i,j} \in \boldsymbol{a}_{(j-i)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, where $\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}$ are intervals independently taking any of the four forms listed in Definition 2.6.

A set of circulant matrices that is of the form $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ for intervals $\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}$ is called an interval circulant matrix.

We will also use the following convenient notational shortcuts for index sets $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$.

Definition 2.8 (Index Sets N and N_0). We denote

$$N = \{1, \ldots, n\}, \quad N_0 = \{0, \ldots, n-1\}.$$

In the max-algebraic literature, $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ is called robust if $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, see [4] Section 8.6. In this paper we consider various extensions of this notion in the situation when $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ and $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$, for $\boldsymbol{X}$ an interval vector. These extensions are listed in the following definition.

Definition 2.9 (Interval Robustness). Let $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be an interval and $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ be an interval circulant matrix. Then $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is called

possibly $\boldsymbol{X}$−robust if $(\exists A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))(\forall x \in \boldsymbol{X})[\, x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)\,]$,

universally $\boldsymbol{X}$−robust if $(\forall A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))(\forall x \in \boldsymbol{X})[\, x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)\,]$,

tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}-$*robust* if $(\forall A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))(\exists x \in \boldsymbol{X})[\, x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)\,]$,

weakly tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}-$*robust* if $(\exists A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))(\exists x \in \boldsymbol{X})[x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)]$

and $\boldsymbol{X}$ is called

possibly $\mathcal{Z}^C-$*robust* if $(\exists x \in \boldsymbol{X})(\forall A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))[\, x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)\,]$,

tolerance $\mathcal{Z}^C-$*robust* if $(\forall x \in \boldsymbol{X})(\exists A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))[\, x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)\,]$.

The aim of the final part of the paper will be to derive an efficient characterization of these types of interval robustness.

2.2. Optimal walks, critical graphs and periodicity

We assume that the basic definitions related to weighted digraphs (nodes, edges, walks and their weight and length, cycles, strong connectedness) are known to the reader, who can refer to e.g. [3, 4, 18, 27] for these definitions. However, the following definition is the key one.

Definition 2.10 (Associated Digraphs). Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$. *Weighted digraph* $\mathcal{G}(A)$ *associated with* A is the pair (N, E) where $N = \{1,\ldots,n\}$ is the set of nodes of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ and $E = \{(i,j)\colon A_{i,j} \neq 0\}$ is the set of edges of $\mathcal{G}(A)$, and $A_{i,j}$ is the weight of an edge (i,j).

The reason for its importance for max-algebraic matrix powers lies in the optimal walk interpretations of their entries.

Proposition 2.11. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$. Then for any $t > 0$ and any $i,j \in N$ entry $A^t_{i,j}$ is equal to the greatest weight of all walks of length t connecting i to j.*

Collecting all matrix powers leads to the following object.

Definition 2.12 (Kleene Stars). Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ have $\lambda(A) \leq 1$. Then

$$A^* = I \oplus A \oplus A^2 \oplus \ldots \oplus A^{n-1}$$

is called the *Kleene star of A.*

For $i \neq j$, the i,jth entry of a Kleene star $(A^*_{i,j})$ is equal to the greatest weight of walks of any length connecting i to j. The following proposition characterizes matrices that are Kleene stars.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$. Then $A^* = A$ if and only if one of the following equivalent conditions hold:*

(i) $A^2 = A$ *and* $A_{i,i} = 1$ *for all* $i \in N$;

(ii) $A_{i,i} = 1$ *and* $A_{i,j}A_{j,k} \leq A_{i,k}$ *for all* $i, j, k \in N$.

The concept of irreducible matrix is common for max algebra and non-negative linear algebra, and it is most conveniently defined via the associated digraph.

Definition 2.14 (Irreducible, Reducible and Completely Reducible). A is called *irreducible* if $\mathcal{G}(A)$ is strongly connected, and *reducible* otherwise.

Digraph $\mathcal{G}$ is called *completely reducible* if it consists of several strongly connected components such that there are no walks connecting a node from one component to a node of another component. A is called *completely reducible* if so is $\mathcal{G}(A)$.

The following subdigraph of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ is crucial for the max-algebraic spectral theory and it is an example of completely reducible digraph.

Definition 2.15 (Critical Digraphs). The *critical digraph* of A, denoted by $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$, consists of all nodes and edges of the cycles of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ at which the maximum cycle mean of A (2) is attained. These cycles are called *critical cycles*. The nodes of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ are called *critical nodes* and their set is denoted by $N_c(A)$, and the edges of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ are called *critical edges* and their set is denoted by $E_c(A)$.

Proposition 2.16. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ have $\lambda(A) \neq 0$. Then*

(i) $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ *is completely reducible;*

(ii) *If A is a circulant matrix then $\mathcal{G}(A)$ is also completely reducible.*

The concept of digraph cyclicity is crucial for the ultimate periodicity of $\{A^t\}_{t\geq 1}$.

Definition 2.17 (Cyclicity). For a strongly connected digraph, its *cyclicity* is defined as the g.c.d. of the lengths of all cycles of that digraph.

For a completely reducible digraph its cyclicity is defined as the l.c.m. of the cyclicities of these components.

Cyclicity of digraph $\mathcal{G}$ is denoted by $\sigma(\mathcal{G})$.

We now discuss the ultimate periodicity of max-algebraic matrix powers.

Definition 2.18 (Ultimate Periodicity). Let $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ be a sequence of some elements. If there exists T such that $\alpha_{t+k} = \alpha_t$ for all $t \geq T$ and some k (i.e., α_{t+k} and α_t are identical). Then $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is called ultimately periodic. The least T and the least k for which the above property holds are called the transient and the ultimate period of $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ respectively.

Theorem 2.19 ([6]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be an irreducible matrix with $\lambda(A) \neq 0$. Then $\{(A/\lambda(A))^t\}_{t\geq 1}$ is ultimately periodic and $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_c(A))$ is the ultimate period of that sequence.*

For any $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$, the greatest eigenvalue $\lambda(A)$ is known to be equal to the maximum cycle mean of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ [8]

$$\lambda(A) = \max_{k=1}^{n} \max_{1\leq i_1,\ldots,i_k\leq n} (A_{i_1,i_2} \cdot A_{i_2,i_3} \ldots A_{i_k,i_1})^{1/k}. \tag{2}$$

While $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ may have up to n eigenvalues in general, we will not be interested in their description here, referring the interested reader to [4] Section 4.5.

In this paper we also need the following trivial extension of Theorem 2.19 and its consequence for orbits of vectors.

Corollary 2.20. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be a completely reducible matrix with $\lambda(A) \neq 0$, such that the maximum cycle mean of each component of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ is the same (and equal to $\lambda(A)$). Then $\{(A/\lambda(A))^t\}_{t\geq 1}$ is ultimately periodic and $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_c(A))$ is the ultimate period of that sequence.*

Corollary 2.21 ([6]). *Under the conditions of Theorem 2.19 or Corollary 2.20, $\{(A/\lambda(A))^t \otimes x\}_{t\geq 1}$ is ultimately periodic for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$.*

Let us now introduce some notation related to periodicity.

Definition 2.22. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ have $\lambda(A) \neq 0$. If $\{(A/\lambda(A))^t\}_{t\geq 1}$ is ultimately periodic then denote by $T(A)$ the transient and by $\mathrm{per}(A)$ the ultimate period of that sequence.

Thus $\mathrm{per}(A) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_c(A))$ for any A satisfying the condition of Theorem 2.19 or Corollary 2.20.

The ultimate period of $\{(A/\lambda(A))^t \otimes x\}_{t\geq 1}$ does not necessarily equal the cyclicity of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$, and the attraction cone consists of vectors for which the ultimate period of $\{(A/\lambda(A))^t \otimes x\}_{t\geq 1}$ is equal to 1. We will further need the following characterization of attraction cone.

Proposition 2.23. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be a completely reducible matrix with $\lambda(A) \neq 0$ such that the maximum cycle mean of each component of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ is the same (and equal to $\lambda(A)$). Then*

$$\mathrm{attr}(A) = \{x \neq 0 \colon \lambda(A)A^t \otimes x = A^{t+1} \otimes x\},$$

where $t \geq T(A)$.

Proof. By definition, $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$ if and only if $A^{s+1} \otimes x = \lambda(A)A^s \otimes x$ and $A^s \otimes x \neq 0$ for some s.

For a comletely reducible A we have $A^t \otimes x \neq 0$ for any $x \neq 0$, hence $\lambda(A)A^t \otimes x = A^{t+1} \otimes x$ is sufficient for $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$.

For the necessity observe that $A^{s+1} \otimes x = \lambda(A)A^s \otimes x$ implies $A^{s'+1} \otimes x = \lambda(A)A^{s'} \otimes x$ for some $s' \geq \max(s, T(A))$ and such that $(A/\lambda(A))^{s'} = (A/\lambda(A))^t$, and hence $A^{t+1} \otimes x = \lambda(A)A^t \otimes x$. □

3. Circulant matrices

3.1. Spectral theory

Let us begin this section with the following elementary but useful statements whose proofs are omitted.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p_1, \ldots, p_s, n \in \mathbb{N}$ (the set of natural numbers). Then equation*

$$p_1x_1 + \ldots + p_sx_s \equiv m(\mathrm{mod}\ n) \tag{3}$$

has solution $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_s) \in \mathbb{N}^s$ if and only if number m is a multiple of $\gcd(p_1, \ldots, p_s, n)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be circulant matrices. Then $A \otimes B$ is also circulant. In particular, any max-algebraic power of A (or B) is a circulant.*

Remark 3.3. The claim of Lemma 3.2 holds for circulant matrices over general semirings.

Observe also that the case $\lambda(A) = 0$ is trivial.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be a circulant matrix. Then $\lambda(A) = 0$ if and only if $A = 0$.*

Let us now introduce the following definition that appeared in [28] (see also [4]).

Definition 3.5 (Visualized Matrices). $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ is called

(i) *visualized* if $A_{i,j} \leq \lambda(A)$ for all i, j, and

(ii) *strictly visualized* if it is visualized and $A_{i,j} = \lambda(A)$ if and only if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}_c(A)$.

In the following statements we give an expression for $\lambda(A)$ and argue that A is strictly visualized, for any circulant matrix A.

Theorem 3.6 ([23]). *Let $A = \mathcal{Z}(a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1})$. Then the greatest max-algebraic eigenvalue of A is*

$$\lambda(A) = \max_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i. \tag{4}$$

All nodes in N are critical and $\lambda(A)$ is the unique eigenvalue of A.

Proof. Equation (4) was shown in [23]. Observe also that if node i is contained in a critical cycle $(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k)$ then node j is contained in a critcal cycle $(j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k)$ such that $j_s - i_s \equiv j - i (\text{mod } n)$ for all $s \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. The uniqueness of $\lambda(A)$ now follows from, e.g., [4] Corollary 4.5.8. □

Definition 3.7 (Threshold Digraphs). Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Define the *threshold digraph* of A with respect to h as the subgraph of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ containing all edges (i, j) with $A_{i,j} \geq h$, and all nodes that are beginning and end nodes of those edges.

Lemma 3.8. *If A is a circulant matrix and $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}(A, h)$ then $\mathcal{G}(A, h)$ contains a cycle with edge (i, j).*

Proof: If A is a circulant then (i,j) belongs to a cycle $(i_1,\ldots,i_s)$ with $i_t - i_{t-1} \equiv j-i (\mathrm{mod}\ n)$ for all $t \in \{2,\ldots,s\}$ and $i_1 - i_s \equiv j-i (\mathrm{mod}\ n)$. All edge weights of that cycle are equal to the weight of (i,j) hence the claim. □

Corollary 3.9. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be a nonzero circulant matrix. Then it is strictly visualised, and $\mathcal{G}_c(A) = \mathcal{G}(A,\lambda(A))$.*

Proof: By (4) no entry of A exceeds $\lambda(A)$. Hence A is visualised. Also recall that $\lambda(A) > 0$ by Lemma 3.4.

If $A_{i,j} < \lambda(A)$ then the mean weight of any cycle with edge (i,j) is strictly less than $\lambda(A)$, so (i,j) is not critical. If $A_{i,j} = \lambda(A)$ then by Lemma 3.8 $\mathcal{G}(A,\lambda(A))$ contains a cycle with edge (i,j). Weights of all edges in this cycle are equal to $\lambda(A)$, hence the mean weight of this cycle is $\lambda(A)$, i.e., it is a critical cycle and (i,j) is critical. Thus A is strictly visualised and $\mathcal{G}_c(A) = \mathcal{G}(A,\lambda(A))$. □

The next theorem describes some properties of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ when A is a circulant matrix.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $A = \mathcal{Z}(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}) \neq 0$ and let $p_1,\ldots,p_s \in \{1,\ldots,n-1\}$ be the nonzero indices for which $a_{p_1} = \ldots = a_{p_s} = \lambda(A)$ (if such indices exist) and such that $p_1 > p_2 > \ldots > p_s$.*

(i) *$E_c(A) = \{(i,j)\colon i = j$ if $a_0 = \lambda(A)$ or $j - i \equiv p_k$ where $k \in \{1,\ldots,s\}\}$.*

(ii) [32] *$\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ consists of $m = \gcd(n,p_1,\ldots,p_s)$ isomorphic strongly connected components. Node set of the ith component, for $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, is $\{i, i+m, \ldots, i+(n/m-1)m\}$.*

(iii) [14] *The cyclicity of each of these components is 1 if $a_0 = \lambda(A)$, and $\gcd(\frac{n}{\gcd(n,p_1)}, \frac{p_1-p_2}{\gcd(p_1,p_2)}, \frac{p_1-p_3}{\gcd(p_1,p_3)}, \ldots, \frac{p_1-p_s}{\gcd(p_1,p_s)})$ otherwise.*

Proof.
(i): Follows by Corollary 3.9 (since $\mathcal{G}_c(A) = \mathcal{G}(A,\lambda(A))$).

(ii): Consider a critical component containing node i, for i from the set $\{1,\ldots,\gcd(n,p_1,\ldots,p_s)\}$. Using Lemma 3.1 we observe that the node set of this component consists of all nodes of the form $i+k\gcd(n,p_1,\ldots,p_s))(\mathrm{mod}\ n)$ for $k \in \{0,\ldots,(n/\gcd(n,p_1,\ldots,p_s)) - 1\}$. It does not intersect with any

component containing a different node in $\{1, \ldots, \gcd(n, p_1, \ldots, p_s)\}$, and this yields $\gcd(n, p_1, \ldots, p_s)$ strongly connected components of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$. Isomorphism between two components containing $i_1 \in \{1, \ldots, \gcd(n, p_1, \ldots, p_s)\}$ and $i_2 \in \{1, \ldots, \gcd(n, p_1, \ldots, p_s)\}$ is induced by the following mapping on their set of nodes:

$$i_1 + s \gcd(n, p_1, \ldots, p_k))(\text{mod } n) \mapsto i_2 + s \gcd(n, p_1, \ldots, p_k))(\text{mod } n).$$

(iii): If $a_0 = \lambda(A)$ then $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ contains all loops of the form (i, i) for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and the cyclicity of every component of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ is 1 since it contains a loop. When $a_0 < \lambda(A)$, we can use the result of [14] Theorem 3.3 part (i) since this result describes the cyclicity of any component of the threshold digraph $\mathcal{G}(A, \lambda(A))$ (see [14] Theorem 3.1.), and since $\mathcal{G}_c(A) = \mathcal{G}(A, \lambda(A))$ by Corollary 3.9. □

We now collect some statements about circulants that will be useful for the rest of the paper.

Theorem 3.11. *Let $A = \mathcal{Z}(a_0, \ldots a_{n-1}) \neq 0$ and let $p_1, \ldots, p_s \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ be the nonzero indices for which $a_{p_1} = \ldots = a_{p_s} = \lambda(A)$ (if such indices exist) such that $p_1 > p_2 \ldots > p_s$.*

(i) $\text{per}(A) = 1$ *if* $\lambda(A) = a_0$ *and*
$\text{per}(A) = \gcd(\frac{n}{\gcd(n,p_1)}, \frac{p_1-p_2}{\gcd(p_1,p_2)}, \frac{p_1-p_3}{\gcd(p_1,p_3)}, \ldots, \frac{p_1-p_s}{\gcd(p_1,p_s)})$ *otherwise.*

(ii) $T(A) \leq (n-1)^2 + 1$.

(iii) $(A/\lambda(A))^{n^2}$ *is a Kleene star.*

(iv) $\text{attr}(A) = \{x \neq 0 \colon \lambda(A)A^{n^2} \otimes x = A^{n^2+1} \otimes x\}$.

Proof.

(i): As all components of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ are isomorphic to one another, $\text{per}(A)$ is equal to the cyclicity of any of them (using Theorem 3.10) part (ii), and the claim follows by Theorem 3.10 part (iii).

(ii): Since $\lambda(A) \neq 0$ by Lemma 3.4 we assume $\lambda(A) = 1$ without loss of generality. Since all nodes of A are critical, the transient of periodicity of $\{A, A^2, A^3, \ldots\}$ is the same as the greatest transient of periodicity of any sequence of rows of these powers $\{A_{i\bullet}, A^2_{i\bullet}, A^4_{i\bullet}, \ldots\}$ where i is critical. However, these transients are bounded by $(n-1)^2 + 1$ by [18] Main Theorem 1.

(iii): By Proposition 2.13 we need to show that $(A/\lambda(A))^{n^2}$ is an idempotent matrix and that $(A/\lambda(A))^{n^2}_{ii} = 1$ for all i. For the idempotency, observe that by (i) $\mathrm{per}(A)$ divides n^2, and by (ii) $T(A) \leq n^2$. Hence $(A/\lambda(A))^{2n^2} = (A/\lambda(A))^{n^2}$. For the remaining part of the claim, take $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and observe that $\mathcal{G}(A)$ contains a cycle going through i, of length $\gcd(n, p_1)$ and the weights of all entries equal to 1. Hence there is a walk in $\mathcal{G}(A)$ of weight 1 and length n^2 beginning and ending in i. The claim $(A/\lambda(A))^{n^2}_{i,i} = 1$ follows since the weights of all entries and (therefore) of all walks are bounded by 1.

(iv): The claim follows by Proposition 2.23. Note that A and n^2 satisfy the conditions of that Proposition since $T(A) \leq n^2$ and since circulant matrix is completely reducible and all components of $\mathcal{G}(A)$ have the same maximum cycle mean. □

Remark 3.12. Using [14] Theorem 3.3 parts (ii) and (iii) we also obtain the following expressions for $\mathrm{per}(A)$ (i.e., the cyclicity of any component of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$) for the case when $a_0 < \lambda(A)$:

(i) $\gcd(\frac{n}{\gcd(n,p_1)}, \frac{p_1-p_2}{\gcd(p_1,p_2)}, \frac{p_2-p_3}{\gcd(p_2,p_3)}, \ldots, \frac{p_{s-1}-p_s}{\gcd(p_{s-1},p_s)})$;

(ii) $\gcd(\frac{n}{\gcd(n,p_1)}, \frac{p_1-p_2}{\gcd(n,p_1,p_2)}, \frac{p_1-p_3}{\gcd(n,p_1,p_2,p_3)} \ldots, \frac{p_1-p_s}{\gcd(n,p_1,\ldots,p_s)})$.

Remark 3.13. One can also suggest tighter bounds on $T(A)$ for circulant A based on the results of [18].

3.2. Inclusion of attraction cones

Before considering the problem of our interest, let us recall the notion of cyclic classes which will be necessary for some proofs.

Definition 3.14 (Cyclic Classes). Let $\mathcal{G} = (N, E)$ be a strongly connected graph with cyclicity $\sigma(\mathcal{G})$, and let $i, j \in N$. Nodes i, j are said to belong to the same *cyclic class* if the lengths of some (and hence all) walks connecting i to j are a multiple of $\sigma(\mathcal{G})$.

The cyclic class of i will be denoted by $[i]$. We also write $[i] \to_1 [j]$ if the lengths of some (and hence all) walks connecting a member of $[i]$ to a member of $[j]$ have length congruent to 1 modulo $\sigma(\mathcal{G})$.

By cyclic classes of a completely reducible digraph we mean cyclic classes of its (strongly connected) components.

Cyclic classes are also called *components of imprimitivity*. We refer the reader to [3] for a proof that belonging to the same cyclic class is a well-defined equivalence relation. Proof of the following statement will be omitted.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a strongly connected digraph.*

(i) *Let $\sigma(\mathcal{G}) > 1$ and let $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_k$ be a walk on $\mathcal{G}$. Then $[i_{l-1}] \to_1 [i_l]$ for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.*

(ii) *Let C be a cycle of $\mathcal{G}$. Then C contains a member of each cyclic class of $\mathcal{G}$.*

We now derive a convenient form of a system defining the attraction cone for visualized matrices, based on the results of [26, 27]. Here $A^t_{i\bullet}$ denotes the ith row of A^t. We also write $i \sim_A j$ when i and j belong to the same component of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$.

Proposition 3.16. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_+$ be completely reducible, visualized and such that $\lambda(A) = 1$ is the maximal cycle mean of all components of $\mathcal{G}(A)$. Let $t \geq T(A)$. Then*

$$x \in \operatorname{attr}(A) \Leftrightarrow x \neq 0,\ A^t_{i\bullet} \otimes x = A^t_{j\bullet} \otimes x\ \forall i, j \in N_c(A)\ s.t.\ [i] \to_1 [j] \quad (5)$$

and

$$x \in \operatorname{attr}(A) \Leftrightarrow x \neq 0,\ A^t_{i\bullet} \otimes x = A^t_{j\bullet} \otimes x\ \forall i, j \in N_c(A)\ s.t.\ i \sim_A j. \quad (6)$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.23

$$\operatorname{attr}(A) = \{x \neq 0 \colon A^t \otimes x = A^{t+1} \otimes x\} \quad (7)$$

By [27] Theorem 4.3, the system in (7) is equivalent to its critical subsystem and hence

$$\operatorname{attr}(A) = \{x \neq 0 \colon A^t_{i\bullet} \otimes x = A^{t+1}_{i\bullet} \otimes x \quad \forall i \in N_c(A)\}$$

By [27] Proposition 2.8 we also have $A^t_{j\bullet} = A^{t+1}_{i\bullet}$ for any $i, j \in N_c(A)$ such that $[i] \to_1 [j]$. This shows (5). To show (6) recall that if a component of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ has more than one cyclic class then for every two nodes i, j of the component there is a walk $i_0 = i, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k = j$ on $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ where $[i_{l-1}] \to_1 [i_l]$ for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ by Lemma 3.15 part (i). Hence $A^t_{i\bullet} \otimes x = A^t_{j\bullet} \otimes x$ holds

for all nodes i, j in that component. If a component has only one cyclic class then [27] Proposition 2.8 implies that all rows with indices in that component are equal to each other, so the equations $A^t_{i\bullet} \otimes x = A^t_{j\bullet} \otimes x$ hold trivially for all pairs of nodes from that component. □

We will also need the following observations.

Lemma 3.17. *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_+$ be two matrices such that $\lambda(A) = \lambda(B)$ and $A \leq B$. Then $\mathcal{G}_c(A) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_c(B)$.*

Proof. Since $A \leq B$ the mean weight of each cycle in B is not less than the mean weight of the same cycle in A. If that cycle is critical in A then its mean weight $\lambda(A)$ cannot increase in B since $\lambda(A) = \lambda(B)$. Hence it equals $\lambda(B)$, i.e., the cycle belongs to $\mathcal{G}_c(B)$. □

Lemma 3.18. *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_+$ be two circulant matrices with $\lambda(A) = \lambda(B) = 1$ and $A \leq B$. Then*

$$x \in \operatorname{attr}(B) \Leftrightarrow x \neq 0,\ B^t_{i\bullet} \otimes x = B^t_{j\bullet} \otimes x \quad \forall i, j \in N_c(A),\ i \sim_A j. \tag{8}$$

Proof. Since B is completely reducible and all maximum cycle means of the components of $\mathcal{G}(B)$ are equal to 1, equation (6) applies to $\operatorname{attr}(B)$. We also have $\mathcal{G}_c(A) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_c(B)$ by Lemma 3.17 and hence each $x \in \operatorname{attr}(B)$ satisfies the system in (8).

Suppose now that x satisfies the system in(8). We will show that x also satisfies (5). Since $\mathcal{G}_c(A) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_c(B)$, each component α of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ belongs to a component β of $\mathcal{G}_c(B)$, and each component of $\mathcal{G}_c(B)$ contains a component of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ because $N_c(A) = N_c(B) = N$. Hence it amounts to show that if x satisfies the subsystem of equations in (8) corresponding to a component α of $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ then it also satisfies the subsystem of equations in (5) corresponding to the component β of $\mathcal{G}_c(B)$ such that $\alpha \subseteq \beta$. But by Lemma 3.15 part (ii) each cyclic class of β has a member in any cycle of β and hence in any cycle of α (because $\alpha \subseteq \beta$). Hence the claim. □

Theorem 3.19. *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_+$ be two circulant matrices such that $\lambda(A) = \lambda(B)$ and $A \leq B$. Then* $\operatorname{attr}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{attr}(B)$.

Proof. Assume without loss of generality $\lambda(A) = \lambda(B) = 1$ and consider matrices $C = A^{n^2}$ and $D = B^{n^2}$. By Lemma 3.2 C and D are circulants, hence $C = \mathcal{Z}(c_0, \ldots, c_{n-1})$ and $D = \mathcal{Z}(d_0, \ldots, d_{n-1})$ for some $c_0, \ldots, c_{n-1}$ and $d_0, \ldots, d_{n-1}$. We have $C \leq D$. By Theorem 3.11 part (iii) both of them are also Kleene stars. By Proposition 2.13 we have $D_{1,\alpha+\gamma} \geq D_{1,\alpha} \cdot D_{\alpha,\alpha+\gamma}$ and hence

$$d_{\alpha+\gamma-1(\mathrm{mod}\ n)} \geq d_{\alpha-1} \cdot d_\gamma \tag{9}$$

for any $\alpha \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\gamma \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. In what follows we are going to show that the assumption that $\mathrm{attr}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{attr}(B)$ does not hold leads to a contradiction with (9) for some α and γ.

By Lemma 3.17 we have $\mathcal{G}_c(A) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_c(B)$. By Theorem 3.10 part (ii), $\mathcal{G}_c(A)$ consists of l components whose node sets are of the form

$$(k, k+l, k+2l, \ldots, k+(n/l-1)l, k) \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, \ldots, l\}, \tag{10}$$

where l is a divisor of n. Each of these node sets belongs to some component of $\mathcal{G}_c(B)$.

By Proposition 3.16 $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$ if and only if

$$C_{k\bullet} \otimes x = C_{k+l\bullet} \otimes x = \ldots = C_{k+(n/l-1)l\bullet} \otimes x \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, \ldots, l\}, \tag{11}$$

and by Lemma 3.18 $x \in \mathrm{attr}(B)$ if and only if

$$D_{k\bullet} \otimes x = D_{k+l\bullet} \otimes x = \ldots = D_{k+(n/l-1)l\bullet} \otimes x \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, \ldots, l\}, \tag{12}$$

Suppose by contradiction that $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$ but $x \notin \mathrm{attr}(B)$. The latter means that there exist k and s such that $D_{k\bullet} \otimes x > D_{k+ls\bullet} \otimes x$ for some integers k and s. Assume without loss of generality that $k = 1$ then

$$D_{1\bullet} \otimes x = d_0 x_1 \oplus d_1 x_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus d_{n-1} x_n.$$

Let $d_{\alpha-1} \cdot x_\alpha$ be one of the terms where the maximum in the above expression is attained. In $D_{1+ls\bullet} \otimes x$ we find a term $d_{\alpha-1} \cdot x_\beta$ where $\alpha \equiv_l \beta$, and we have the inequality $d_{\alpha-1} \cdot x_\alpha > d_{\alpha-1} \cdot x_\beta$ and hence $x_\alpha > x_\beta$.

Observe that $c_0 = d_0 = 1$ since C and D are Kleene stars. Since $\alpha \equiv_l \beta$ there exists a chain of equations among those of (11), which contains both $c_0 x_\alpha = x_\alpha$ and $c_0 x_\beta = x_\beta$. The corresponding chain of equations holds (since $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$), but $x_\alpha > x_\beta$ and therefore in the expression containing $c_0 x_\beta$

there is a term $c_\gamma x_{(\beta+\gamma)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}$ (for some γ) such that $c_\gamma x_{(\beta+\gamma)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)} \geq x_\alpha > 0$, and hence

$$d_\gamma x_{(\beta+\gamma)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)} \geq x_\alpha. \tag{13}$$

Going back to the terms in the inequality $D_{1,\bullet}x > D_{1+ls,\bullet}x$ and knowing that the maximum in $D_{1,\bullet}x$ is attained at $d_{\alpha-1}x_\alpha$ and $D_{1+ls,\bullet}x$ contains a term of the form $d_{\alpha-1}x_\beta$, we see that $D_{1+ls,\bullet}x$ also contains the term $d_{(\alpha+\gamma-1)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}x_{(\beta+\gamma)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}$ and that

$$d_{\alpha-1}x_\alpha > d_{(\alpha+\gamma-1)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}x_{(\beta+\gamma)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)}. \tag{14}$$

Multiplying (13) by $d_{\alpha-1}$, combining with (14) and canceling $x_{(\beta+\gamma)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)} > 0$ we have

$$d_{\alpha-1}d_\gamma > d_{(\alpha+\gamma-1)(\mathrm{mod}\ n)},$$

which contradicts with the Kleene star property (9). The proof is complete. □

The claim of Theorem 3.19 is not true for general matrices as the following example shows. Take

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 1 & 0.2 \\ 1 & 0.5 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 1 & 0.2 \\ 1 & 0.5 & 0.3 \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus $A \leq B$. The ultimate periods of $\{A, A^2, A^3, \ldots\}$ and $\{B, B^2, B^3, \ldots\}$ equal 2. In the first case, the periodicity starts from A^2 (i.e., we have $A^2 = A^4$), and in the second case it starts from B^3 (i.e., we have $B^3 = B^5$). Attraction cones are

$$\mathrm{attr}(A) = \{x\colon A^3 \otimes x = A^4 \otimes x\}, \quad \mathrm{attr}(B) = \{x\colon B^3 \otimes x = B^4 \otimes x\},$$

where

$$A^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 1 & 0.2 \\ 1 & 0.5 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.04 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.5 & 0.2 \\ 0.5 & 1 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.04 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$B^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 1 & 0.2 \\ 1 & 0.5 & 0.3 \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.12 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.5 & 0.3 \\ 0.5 & 1 & 0.2 \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.12 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We further see that in both cases, the system defining attraction cones reduces to just one equation:

$$\operatorname{attr}(A) = \{x\colon 0.5x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus 0.2x_3 = x_1 \oplus 0.5x_2 \oplus 0.2x_3\},$$
$$\operatorname{attr}(B) = \{x\colon 0.5x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus 0.2x_3 = x_1 \oplus 0.5x_2 \oplus 0.3x_3\},$$

Observe that $x = [1\ 1\ 5]$ belongs to $\operatorname{attr}(A)$ but not to $\operatorname{attr}(B)$, thus $\operatorname{attr}(A) \not\subseteq \operatorname{attr}(B)$.

4. Interval robustness

4.1. Universal and possible $\boldsymbol{X}-$robustness

Let us introduce the following notation.

Definition 4.1 (Matrices $A^{(k)}$ and vectors $x^{(k)}$). For a given index $k \in N_0$ denote

$$A^{(k)} = \mathcal{Z}(\underline{a}_0, \underline{a}_1, \dots, \underline{a}_{k-1}, \overline{a}_k, \underline{a}_{k+1}, \dots, \underline{a}_{n-1}),$$

and

$$x^{(k)} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{k-1}, \overline{x}_k, \underline{x}_{k+1}, \dots, \underline{x}_{n-1})$$

Definition 4.2 (Intervals $\check{\boldsymbol{X}}$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{X}}^A$). Denote:

$$\check{\boldsymbol{X}}_i = \{s\colon s \cdot \overline{x}_i \in \boldsymbol{X}_i\}, \quad \check{\boldsymbol{X}} = \times_{i=1}^n \check{\boldsymbol{X}}_i,$$
$$\check{\boldsymbol{X}}_i^A = \{s\colon s \cdot \overline{a}_i \in \boldsymbol{a}_i\}, \quad \check{\boldsymbol{X}}^A = \times_{i=1}^n \check{\boldsymbol{X}}_i^A.$$

Vectors $x^{(k)}$ and matrices $A^{(k)}$ can be seen as "generators" of $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be an interval vector. Then $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$ if and only if $x = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \beta_k x^{(k)}$ with $\beta \in \check{\boldsymbol{X}}$. In particular,*

$$x = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \frac{x_k}{\overline{x}_k} x^{(k)}. \tag{15}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a_0}, \boldsymbol{a_1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{a_{n-1}})$ be an interval circulant matrix. Then $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ if and only if $A = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n-1} \gamma_k A^{(k)}$ with $\gamma \in \check{\boldsymbol{X}}^A$. In particular,*

$$A = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{\overline{a}_k} A^{(k)}. \tag{16}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ have $\lambda(A) \neq 0$ and $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$ for each $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$ if and only if $x^{(i)} \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$ for each $i \in N$.*

Proof. Observe first that since the cone $\mathrm{attr}(A)$ is a closed set, inclusion $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathrm{attr}(A)$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{cl}(\boldsymbol{X}) \subseteq \mathrm{attr}(A)$, where cl is a Euclidean closure. Then we can suppose that $\boldsymbol{X}$ is closed. As shown in Lemma 4.3 each $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$ is a max-linear combination of $x^{(i)}$. Since $\mathrm{attr}(A)$ is a max cone (Definition 2.4), for $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathrm{attr}(A)$ it is sufficient that each $x^{(i)}$ is in $\mathrm{attr}(A)$, hence the sufficiency. The necessity of the condition is obvious. □

Definition 4.6 (Matrix $\hat{A}$). *For $\underline{a} = \max\limits_{k\in N_0} \underline{a}_k$ define*

$$\hat{A} = \mathcal{Z}(\hat{a}_0, \hat{a}_1, \ldots, \hat{a}_{n-1}),$$

where

$$\hat{a}_i = \min\{\underline{a}, \overline{a}_i\}, \text{ for each } i \in N_0.$$

$\hat{A}$ has the following remarkable property.

Lemma 4.7. *If $\hat{A} \neq 0$, then $(\forall A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))[(A/\lambda(A)) \leq (\hat{A}/\lambda(\hat{A})]$.*

Proof. Observe that $\hat{A} \neq 0$ implies that $A = 0$ does not belong to the interval matrix $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$. Recalling that $\hat{a}_i = \min(\overline{a}_i, \underline{a})$ for all i we see that $\hat{a}_i \leq \underline{a}$ for all i and that $\hat{a}_k = \underline{a}$ for k such that $\underline{a}_k = \underline{a}$. Hence $\lambda(\hat{A}) = \underline{a}$. Showing $(A/\lambda(A)) \leq (\hat{A}/\lambda(\hat{A})$ means showing

$$a_i / \max_k a_k \leq \min(\overline{a}_i, \underline{a})/\underline{a} \quad \forall i. \tag{17}$$

To prove (17) we observe that it follows from the inequality

$$a_i \cdot \underline{a} \leq \max_j a_j \cdot \min(\overline{a}_i, \underline{a}) \quad \forall i, \tag{18}$$

which is

$$a_i \cdot \underline{a} \leq \max_j a_j \cdot \underline{a} \tag{19}$$

when $\min(\overline{a}_i, \underline{a}) = \underline{a}$, and

$$a_i \cdot \max_i \underline{a}_i \leq \overline{a}_i \cdot \max_j a_j \tag{20}$$

when $\min(\overline{a}_i, \underline{a}) = \overline{a}_i$. Both (19) and (20) are obvious. This shows (18) and hence (17) and $(A/\lambda(A)) \leq (\hat{A}/\lambda(\hat{A}))$. □

We now characterize possibly $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust and universally $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust interval circulant matrices.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be a circulant interval matrix such that $\hat{A} \neq 0$, $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$, and let $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be an interval. Then $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is possibly $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust if and only if we have $x^{(i)} \in \operatorname{attr}(\hat{A})$ for all $i \in N$.*

Proof. We need to show that there exists $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ such that for each $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$ with $\operatorname{per}(A, x) = 1$ if and only if $x^{(i)} \in \operatorname{attr}(\hat{A})$ for all $i \in N$.

"If": By Lemma 4.5, the condition implies that $\operatorname{per}(\hat{A}, x) = 1$ for every $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$. The claim then follows since $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$.

"Only if": Let $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ be such that $\operatorname{per}(A, x) = 1$ for all $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$. By Lemma 4.7 we have $(A/\lambda(A)) \leq (\hat{A}/\lambda(\hat{A}))$, and Theorem 3.19 yields that $x \in \operatorname{attr} \hat{A}$, i.e., $\operatorname{per}(\hat{A}, x) = 1$. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 4.9. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ be a circulant interval matrix such that $\hat{A} \neq 0$, $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$. Then there exists a matrix $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ such that $\operatorname{per}(A, x) = 1$ if and only if $x \in \operatorname{attr}(\hat{A})$.*

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ be a circulant interval matrix and let $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be an interval vector. Then $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is universally $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust if and only if $x^{(j)} \in \operatorname{attr}(A^{(i)})$ for all $i \in N_0, j \in N$ such that $A^{(i)}$ and $x^{(j)}$ are nonzero.*

Proof. We need to show that $\operatorname{per}(A, x) = 1$ for all $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ and $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$ if and only if $\operatorname{per}(A^{(i)}, x^{(j)}) = 1$ for all $i \in N_0$ and $j \in N$.

"If": It suffices to show that given any $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$, if $x \in \operatorname{attr}(A^{(i)})$ for all $i \in N$ then $x \in \operatorname{attr}(A)$ for any $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$.

Let $x \in \operatorname{attr}(A^{(i)})$ hold for all $i \in N_0$ and take arbitrary $A \neq 0$ from $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$. Let $a_k = \max_{j\in N} a_j$, and consider $A^{(k)}$. Since $\overline{a}_k \geq a_k > 0$ but the rest of the components defining $A^{(k)}$ are $\underline{a}_i \leq a_i$ for $i \neq k$, we have $\lambda(A^{(k)}) = \overline{a}_k$ and $(A^{(k)}/\lambda(A^{(k)})) \leq (A/\lambda(A))$. Applying Theorem 3.19 to $(A^{(k)}/\lambda(A^{(k)}))$ and $(A/\lambda(A))$ we obtain $x \in \operatorname{attr}(A)$, hence the claim.

"Only if": Take a sequence $\{A_s\}_{s\geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ such that $\lim_{s\to\infty} A_s = A^{(k)}$, and take any $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$. Since $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A_s)$ for all s, we have $\lambda(A_s)A_s^{n^2} \otimes x = A_s^{n^2+1} \otimes x$ for all s, and by continuity we obtain $\lambda(A^{(k)})(A^{(k)})^{n^2} \otimes x = (A^{(k)})^{n^2+1} \otimes x$, from which either $A^{(k)} = 0$ (trivial) or $\lambda(A^{(k)}) = 0$ by Lemma 3.4 and $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A^{(k)})$. □

Corollary 4.11. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ be nonzero and let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}_+$ be an interval circulant matrix. Then $(\forall A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))\,[x \in \mathrm{attr}(A)\,]$ if and only if $x \in \mathrm{attr}(A^{(k)})$ for each $k \in N_0$.*

4.2. Tolerance and weak tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}-$robustness

Theorem 4.12. *Let $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n_+$ be a closed interval not containing 0, and let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ be an interval circulant matrix. Then $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}-$robust if and only if $(\forall k \in N_0, A^{(k)} \neq 0)(\exists y^{(k)} \in \boldsymbol{X})[y^{(k)} \in \mathrm{attr}(A^{(k)})]$.*

Proof.

"If": Suppose that $(\exists y^{(k)} \in \boldsymbol{X})[y^{(k)} \in \mathrm{attr}(A^{(k)}]$ holds for all $k \in N_0$ and take arbitrary nonzero $A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$. By Lemma 4.3 the matrix A has the form $A = \bigoplus_{i\in N_0\,:\,\overline{a}_i\neq 0} A^{(i)}\frac{\underline{a}_i}{\overline{a}_i}$. Let $a_k = \max_{j\in N_0} a_j$, and consider $A^{(k)}$. Since $\overline{a}_k \geq a_k > 0$ but the rest of the components defining $A^{(k)}$ are $\underline{a}_i \leq a_i$ for $i \neq k$, we have $\lambda(A^{(k)}) = \overline{a}_k$ and $(A^{(k)}/\lambda(A^{(k)})) \leq (A/\lambda(A))$. Applying Theorem 3.19 to $(A^{(k)}/\lambda(A^{(k)}))$ and $(A/\lambda(A))$ we obtain $y^{(k)} \in \mathrm{attr}(A)$, hence the implication.

"Only if": Take a sequence $\{A_s\}_{s\geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ such that $\lim_{s\to\infty} A_s = A^{(k)}$, for any k such that $A^{(k)} \neq 0$. For each of these matrices there exists $x^s \in \boldsymbol{X}$ such that $x^s \in \mathrm{attr}(A_s)$. Then we have $\lambda(A_s)A_s^{n^2} \otimes x^s = A_s^{n^2+1} \otimes x^s$ for all s. Since $\boldsymbol{X}$ is compact, we can assume that $\lim_{s\to\infty} x^s$ exists and denote it by $y^{(k)}$. Then we obtain that by continuity $\lambda(A^{(k)})(A^{(k)})^{n^2} \otimes y^{(k)} = (A^{(k)})^{n^2+1} \otimes y^{(k)}$. Hence $y^{(k)} \in \mathrm{attr}(A^{(k)})$. □

Corollary 4.13. *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.12, $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}-$robust if and only if all systems*

$$\lambda(A^{(k)})(A^{(k)})^{n^2} \otimes y = (A^{(k)})^{n^2+1} \otimes y, \quad y \in \boldsymbol{X}, \tag{21}$$

with $k \in N_0$ such that $A^{(k)} \neq 0$ are solvable.

We now characterize weak tolerance robust matrices.

Definition 4.14 (Matrix $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, r)$). *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ be an interval circulant matrix such that $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ and $\hat{A} \neq 0$, and let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be an interval. Define matrix $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$:*

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, r) = \left(\left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^r \otimes x^{(1)}, \ldots, \left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^r \otimes x^{(n)} \right).$$

Theorem 4.15. *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ be an interval circulant matrix such that $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ and $\hat{A} \neq 0$, and let $\boldsymbol{X}$ be an interval. Then $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is weakly tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}-$robust if and only if $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, n^2) \otimes \beta = \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, n^2 + 1) \otimes \beta$ is solvable with $\beta \in \check{\boldsymbol{X}}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, if $\beta \in \check{\boldsymbol{X}}$ then $x = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i \otimes x^{(i)}$ belongs to $\boldsymbol{X}$, and if $x \in \boldsymbol{X}$ then we can find $\beta \in \check{\boldsymbol{X}}$ such that $x = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i \otimes x^{(i)}$.

We also have the following equivalences:

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, n^2) \otimes \beta = \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{X}, n^2 + 1) \otimes \beta \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\bigoplus_{i \in N} \left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^{n^2} \otimes x^{(i)} \otimes \beta_i = \bigoplus_{i \in N} \left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^{n^2+1} \otimes x^{(i)} \otimes \beta_i \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^{n^2} \otimes \bigoplus_{i \in N} x^{(i)} \otimes \beta_i = \left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^{n^2+1} \otimes \bigoplus_{i \in N} x^{(i)} \otimes \beta_i \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^{n^2} \otimes x = \left(\frac{\hat{A}}{\lambda(\hat{A})}\right)^{n^2+1} \otimes x \Leftrightarrow$$

$$x \in \operatorname{attr}(\hat{A}) \Leftrightarrow (\exists A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))\, x \in \operatorname{attr}(A)$$

(the last equivalence due to Corollary 4.9). Hence the claim. □

4.3. Possible and tolerance $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})-$robustness

Let us first introduce the following notation:

Definition 4.16 (Matrix $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}^C,\boldsymbol{X},r)$). *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ and $\boldsymbol{X}$ be given. Define*

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}^C,\boldsymbol{X},r)=\begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{A^{(0)}}{\lambda(A^{(0)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(1)} & \left(\frac{A^{(0)}}{\lambda(A^{(0)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(2)} & \ldots & \left(\frac{A^{(0)}}{\lambda(A^{(0)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(n)} \\ \left(\frac{A^{(1)}}{\lambda(A^{(1)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(1)} & \left(\frac{A^{(1)}}{\lambda(A^{(1)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(2)} & \ldots & \left(\frac{A^{(1)}}{\lambda(A^{(1)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(n)} \\ \vdots & & & \\ \left(\frac{A^{(n-1)}}{\lambda(A^{(n-1)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(1)} & \left(\frac{A^{(n-1)}}{\lambda(A^{(n-1)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(2)} & \ldots & \left(\frac{A^{(n-1)}}{\lambda(A^{(n-1)})}\right)^r\otimes x^{(n)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Theorem 4.17. *Let $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})\subseteq\mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}\subseteq\mathbb{R}_+^n$ be given. Then $\boldsymbol{X}$ is possibly $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0,\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})-$robust if and only if max linear system $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}^C,\boldsymbol{X},n^2)\otimes\beta=\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}^C,\boldsymbol{X},n^2+1)\otimes\beta$ is solvable with $\beta\in\check{\boldsymbol{X}}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, if $\beta\in\check{\boldsymbol{X}}$ then $x=\bigoplus_{i=1}^n\beta_i\otimes x^{(i)}$ belongs to $\boldsymbol{X}$, and if $x\in\boldsymbol{X}$ then we can find $\beta\in\check{\boldsymbol{X}}$ such that $x=\bigoplus_{i=1}^n\beta_i\otimes x^{(i)}$. We also have the following equivalences:

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}^C,\boldsymbol{X},n^2)\otimes\beta=\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{Z}^C,\boldsymbol{X},n^2+1)\otimes\beta\Leftrightarrow$$

$$(\forall j)[\bigoplus_{i\in N}\left(\frac{A^{(j)}}{\lambda(A^{(j)})}\right)^{n^2}\otimes x^{(i)}\otimes\beta_i=\bigoplus_{i\in N}\left(\frac{A^{(j)}}{\lambda(A^{(j)})}\right)^{n^2+1}\otimes x^{(i)}\otimes\beta_i]\Leftrightarrow$$

$$(\forall j)[\left(\frac{A^{(j)}}{\lambda(A^{(j)})}\right)^{n^2}\otimes\bigoplus_{i\in N}x^{(i)}\otimes\beta_i=\left(\frac{A^{(j)}}{\lambda(A^{(j)})}\right)^{n^2+1}\otimes\bigoplus_{i\in N}x^{(i)}\otimes\beta_i]\Leftrightarrow$$

$$(\forall j)[\left(\frac{A^{(j)}}{\lambda(A^{(j)})}\right)^{n^2}\otimes x=\left(\frac{A^{(j)}}{\lambda(A^{(j)})}\right)^{n^2+1}\otimes x]\Leftrightarrow$$

$$(\forall j)x\in\mathrm{attr}(A^{(j)})\Leftrightarrow(\forall A\in\boldsymbol{A}^C)x\in\mathrm{attr}(A)$$

(the last equivalence due to Corollary 4.11). Hence the claim. □

Theorem 4.18. *Let $\boldsymbol{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n_+$ be an interval, and $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}) \neq 0$ be an interval circulant matrix such that $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$. Then interval vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ is tolerance $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})-$robust if and only if $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is possibly $\boldsymbol{X}-$robust.*

Proof. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{X}$ is tolerance $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})-$robust, then we have the following

$$(\forall x \in \boldsymbol{X})(\exists A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))[\, x \in \operatorname{attr}(A)\,] \overset{\text{Cor.}4.9}{\iff} (\forall x \in \boldsymbol{X})[\, x \in \operatorname{attr}(A)\,]$$
$$\Rightarrow (\exists A \in \mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1}))(\forall x \in \boldsymbol{X})[\, x \in \operatorname{attr}(A)\,],$$

and hence we have that $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is possibly $\boldsymbol{X}-$robust.

The converse implication is trivial. □

We close the paper with a couple of remarks on the computational complexity of the different types of interval robustness.

Remark 4.19. By Theorems 4.8 and 4.18 verification of whether

(i) $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is possibly $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust,

(ii) $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is universally $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust,

(iii) $\boldsymbol{X}$ is tolerance $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$-robust

reduces, under some assumptions, to verification whether some vectors satisfy some two-sided max-linear systems with n^2 and $n^2 + 1$ powers of some matrices. Hence these types of robustness are of polynomial complexity.

Remark 4.20. By Corollary 4.13, Theorem 4.17 and Theorem 4.18, verification of whether

(i) $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust,

(ii) $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$ is weakly tolerance $\boldsymbol{X}$-robust,

(iii) $\boldsymbol{X}$ is possibly $\mathcal{Z}^C(\boldsymbol{a}_0, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n-1})$-robust

reduces, under some assumptions, to verifying the non-emptyness of solution set of some system of max-affine inequalities, where some of the inequalities (among those defining $\boldsymbol{X}$) can be strict. This problem was generally shown to be polynomially equivalent to solving a mean-payoff game [1], for which efficient pseudopolynomial algorithms exist, but existence of a polynomial algorithm has been a long-standing open question.

References

[1] X. Allamigeon, A. Legay, U. Fahrenberg, R. Katz, S. Gaubert. Tropical Fourier-Motzkin elimination, with an application to real-time verification. *Internat. J. of Algebra and Computation* 24:5 (2014) 569-607.

[2] F.L. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G.J. Olsder and J.P. Quadrat. *Synchronization and Linearity.* Wiley and Sons, 1992. Available online: `https://www.rocq.inria.fr/metalau/cohen/documents/BCOQ-book.pdf`

[3] R.A. Brualdi and H.J. Ryser. *Combinatorial Matrix Theory.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.

[4] P. Butkovič, *Max-linear Systems: Theory and Algorithms.* Springer, London, 2010.

[5] P. Butkovič, H. Schneider, S. Sergeev. Recognizing weakly stable matrices. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 50:5 (2012) 3029-3051.

[6] G. Cohen, D. Dubois, J.P. Quadrat, M. Viot. Analyse du comportement périodique de systèmes de production par la théorie des dioïdes. INRIA, Rapport de Recherche No. 191, Février, 1983.

[7] P. Collins, M. Niqui, N. Revol. A validated real function calculus. *Math. in Comp. Sci.* 5 (2011) 437–467.

[8] R. A. Cuninghame-Green. *Minimax Algebra.* Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems vol. 166, Springer, Berlin, 1979.

[9] R. A. Cuninghame-Green. Minimax algebra and applications. *Advances in Imaging and Electron Physics* 90 (1995) 1–121.

[10] P.J. Davis. *Circulant Matrices.* Wiley, 1979

[11] M. Fiedler, J. Nedoma, J. Ramík, J. Rohn, K. Zimmermann. *Linear Optimization Problems with Inexact Data.* Springer, Berlin, 2006.

[12] M. Gavalec, J. Plavka, D. Ponce Tolerance types of interval eigenvectors in max-plus algebra. *Information Science* 367-368 (2016) 14–27.

[13] M. Gavalec, K. Zimmermann. Classification of solutions to systems of two-sided equations with interval coefficients. *Internat. J. of Pure and Appl. Math.* 45 (2008) 533–542.

[14] M. Gavalec. Periods of special fuzzy matrices. *Tatra Mt. Math. Publ.* 16 (1999) 47-60.

[15] M. Gavalec. *Periodicity in Extremal Algebra*. Gaudeamus, Hradec Králové 2004.

[16] B. Heidergott, G.-J. Olsder, and J. van der Woude. *Max-plus at Work*. Princeton Univ. Press, 2005.

[17] G.L. Litvinov, A.N. Sobolevskii. Idempotent interval analysis and optimization problems. *Reliable Computing* 7 (2001) 353–377.

[18] G. Merlet, T. Nowak, H. Schneider and S. Sergeev. Generalizations of bounds on the index of convergence to weighted digraphs. *Discr. Appl. Math.* 178 (2014) 121–134.

[19] H. Myšková. Interval systems of max-separable linear equations. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 403 (2005) 263–272.

[20] H. Myšková. Control solvability of interval systems of max-separable linear equations. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 416 (2006) 215–223.

[21] H. Myšková, J. Plavka. The robustness of interval matrices in max-plus algebra. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 445 (2014) 85–102.

[22] H. Nobuhara, D.B.K. Trieu, T. Maruyama, B. Bede. Max-plus algebra-based wavelet transforms and their FPGA implementation for image coding. *Inform. Sci.* 180 (2010) 3232–3247.

[23] J. Plavka. On eigenproblem for circulant matrices in max-algebra. *Optimization* 50:5-6 (2001) 477-483.

[24] J. Plavka. The weak robustness of interval matrices in max-plus algebra *Discrete Appl. Math.* 173 (2014) 92-101.

[25] J. Rohn. Solvability of systems of linear interval equations, *SIAM J. on Matrix Anal. Appl.* 25:1 (2003) 237–245.

[26] S. Sergeev. Max algebraic powers of irreducible matrices in the periodic regime: An application of cyclic classes. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 431 (2009) 13251339.

[27] S. Sergeev. Max-algebraic cones of nonnegative irreducible matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 435 (2011) 1736-1757.

[28] S. Sergeev, H. Schneider and P. Butkovič. On visualization scaling, subeigenvectors and Kleene stars in max algebra. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 431 (2009) 2395–2406.

[29] S.P. Shary. A new technique in systems analysis under interval uncertainty and ambiguity. *Reliable Computing* 8 (2002) 321–418.

[30] F.J. Valverde-Albacete, C. Peláez-Moreno. Extending conceptualisation modes for generalised formal concept analysis. *Inform. Sci.* 181 (2011) 1888–1909.

[31] R. M. Tanner at al. LDPC Block and Convolutional Codes Based on Circulant Matrices. *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory* 50:12 (2004) 2966–2984.

[32] H. Tomášková. Eigenproblem for circulant matrices in max-plus algebra. In: Proceedings of the 29th Conference on Mathematical Methods, Computational Techniques, Intelligent Systems (MAMECTIS-29), 2010.